AD

TECHNICAL REPORT
I
NATICK/TR-78/006

STORAGE STUDY OF FROZEN ENTREE ITEMS DEVELOPED FOR WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER

Project Reference: 83166103000

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

April 1978

UNITED STATES ARMY
NATICK RESEARCH and DEVELOPMENT COMMAND
NATICK, MASSACHUSETTS 01760



Food Engineering Laboratory FEL-73

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

Citation of trade names in this report does not constitute un official indorsement or approval of the use of such items.

Destroy this report when no longer needed. Do not return it to the originator.

BLANK PAGES IN THIS DOCUMENT WERE NOT FILMED

UNCLASSIFIED

The state of the s

BECURITY	CLASSIF	ICATION OF	THIS PAGE	(When Date Entered)

(9) REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
NATICK/TR-78/006 2 V A D-A 091	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER MG9
STORAGE STUDY OF FROZEN ENTREE ITEMS DEVELOPED FOR MALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER.	Technical Performent one, report number FEL- 73
Gerald Darsch Carol Shaw guard Justin Tuomy	6. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
US Army Natick Research and Development Command Natick, Massachusetts 01760	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT HUMBERS 83166103000 6.4
US Army Natick Research & Development Command ATTN: DRXNM-WTA (Animal Products Group) Natick, Massachusetts 01760	12. REPORT DATE November 1977 13. NUMBER OF PAGES
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED 184. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from	r Report)
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identity by block number) FOOD SYSTEMS FOOD ACCEPTANCE FROZEN FOODS WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER	TEST METHODS FOOD SERVICE
STORAGE STABILITY ENTREES SENSES (PHYSIOLOGY) ABSTRACT (Comtinue on review olds it necessary and identify by block number) This report contains results of storage studies in developed for the new Walter Reed Army Medical Centre products were prepared in accordance with products veloped for Walter Reed. Generally, products were	frozen entree products ter food service system. uction guides already de-
evaluated at 0, 1, 2, 6, 9 and 12 months. Average evaluations are shown for each product and are sum final evaluation.	results of technical panel

UNCLASSIFIED 408903

神経のはないというというないないないないないないないできます こうしょうしょう

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Enters

٠,

PREFACE

The new Walter Reed Army Medical Center (WRAMC) food service system utilizing cook-freeze is expected to be in operation in FY78. The Food Engineering Laboratory (FEL) of the U. S. Army Natick Research and Development Command (NARADCOM) has been charged with rendering all possible technical assistance in bringing the system onstream. Considerable efforts are being made to redesign Walter Reed Army Medical Center (WRAMC) menu items so that they can be made on commercial equipment and frozen for storage.

This study is concerned with storage stability of specific entree items developed for WRAMC. The work was performed under the 0&MA program and Army Requirement 4-1, Support to Modern Army Food Service System.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Preface	1
List of Tables	5 & 7
Introduction	9
Procedure	10
Results & Discussion	11

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table No</u> .	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Average Initial and Final Panel Ratings.	12-14
2	Panel Ratings for Barbecued Sliced Beef.	15
3	Panel Ratings for Beef a la Mode.	16
4	Panel Ratings for Beef Stroganoff	17
5	Panel Ratings for Country Style Steak	18
6	Panel Ratings for Creamed Chipped Beef	19
7	Panel Ratings for Egg Foo Yung	20
8	Panel Ratings for Hungarian Goulash	21
9	Panel Ratings for Neopolitan Spaghetti	22
10	Panel Ratings for Pepper Steak	23
11	Panel Ratings for Spanish Steak	24
12	Panel Ratings for Tallerines	25
13	Panel Ratings for Yankee Pot Roast	26
14	Panel Ratings for Perch Yucatan	27
15	Panel Ratings for Salmon Patties	28.
16	Panel Ratings for Seafood Au Gratin	29
17	Panel Ratings for Shrimp Creole	30
18	Panel Ratings for Shrimp Newburg	31
19	Panel Ratings for Tuna Patties	32
20	Panel Ratings for Ham Loaf	33
21	Panel Ratings for Breaded Pork Chops	34
22	Panel Ratings for Arroz Con Pollo	35
23	Panel Ratings for Chicken Cornbread Casserole	36

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page
24	Panel Ratings for Chicken Parmesan	37
25	Panel Ratings for Oriental Chicken	38
26	Panel Ratings for Oven Fried Chicken	39
27	Panel Ratings for Savory Chicken	40
28	Panel Ratings for Turkey Tetrazzini	41
29	Panel Ratings for Breaded Rabbit	42
30	Panel Ratings for Breaded Veal Cutlet	43
31	Panel Ratings for Breaded Veal Balls	1414
32	Panel Ratings for Veal Cordon Bleu	45
33	Panel Ratings for Baked Veal Cutlets	46
34	Panel Ratings for Veal Loaf	47
35	Panel Ratings for Veal Parmesan	५८
36	Panel Ratings for Ruben Sandwich	цо

STORAGE STUDY OF FROZEN ENTREE ITEMS DEVELOPED FOR WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER

INTRODUCTION

Cook-freeze systems tailored for specific situations are being used or contemplated for use in several Armed Forces feeding situations, and it is anticipated that the use of these types of systems will become increasingly important in the future. Length of time products are scheduled to be kept in frozen storage varies from system to system with many systems set up for less than three months storage. In other cases the products could be stored for a year or more.

Unpublished studies conducted at NARADCOM indicate that some frozen products start to deteriorate appreciably between three and six months after being placed in storage. Reasons for this are not clearly understood at the present time, and there is not yet a sure method of predicting product response to storage without actually conducting storage tests.

At the request of Walter Reed Army Medical Center (WRAMC) 38 entree items were developed for use in the new food service facility.* While these products were developed for a system which expects to store them no more than 60 days, the products could be used in other systems which require longer storage. Thirty five of the products were made and stored for one year for testing.

*Young, Raymond, Carol Shaw, Gerald Darsch, Justin Tuomy and George Walker, 1977. Meat and Fish Entree Item Production Guides Prepared for Walter Reed Army Medical Center Technical Report Natick/TR-77/005 US Army Natick Research & Development Command.

PROCEDURE

The entrees were reformulated in the Food Engineering Laboratory (FEL) utilizing troop issue products whenever possible. Adequate quantities to each were prepared to insure that sensory evaluations could be performed at specific intervals for one year. After preparation, the products were placed in half size steam table pans (aluminum disposable), cooled, frozen and stored at (-23°C) .

The entrees were evaluated in FEL by technological panels composed of food technologists familar with each product. Evaluation were performed at specified intervals; i.e., initial, 1, 2, 6, 9 and 12 months. The number of panelists participating in each evaluation will be designated by N in Tables 2 thru 36. The products were reheated in a convection oven (preheated to 163° C) to an internal temperature of 71° C. Quality rating scales with values ranging from 1 (extremely poor) thru 9 (excellent) were used. In determining statistical significance, an analysis of variance utilizing Duncan's Multiple Range Test was employed.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

While there is no cut off number on the panel rating scale below which a product is considered unacceptable, it is usually accepted that a product receiving a rating below 6.0 is borderline and below 5.0 probably unacceptable. Of equal importance to the absolute number is the change during storage.

In Table I, the average initial and final panel ratings for each product are shown with statistical differences being asterisked. In Tables 2 through 36 the average of panel ratings for each product at each withdrawal are given. In going down each column figures followed by the same letter are not statistically different. Numerals followed by different letters are significantly different from each other at at least the 5 percent level.

TABLE 1

AVERAGE INITIAL AND FINAL PANEL RATINGS

Entree	Time	Color	0dor	Flavor	Texture	Appearance
Barbecued Sliced Beef	INT	. 6.9	۲.7	6.9	6.7	7.0
	12 Mo.	- L- Z	6.7	6.1*	6.3	7.0
Beef a la Mode	INT	7.2	7.1	7.1	6.9	7.2
	12 Mo.	7.0	6.8**	**9*9	6.7	6.8
Beef Stroganoff	INI	7.0	7.3	7.2	7.1	7.0
	12 Mo.	8 .9	8.9	6.4	6.3	6.6
Country Style Steak	TNI	6.7	6.9	6.5	9.9	6.7
	12 Mo.	6.7	6.7**	6.3**	6.4	6.6**
Creamed Chipped Beef	TNI	7:3	1.7	7.2	7.2	7.3
	12 Mo.	7:0	*9.9	6.4*	9.9	6.8
Egg Foo Yung	INT	1.1	۲.٦	6.5	7.2	7.2
	2 Mo.	6.9	6.9	9.9	9.9	7.1
Hungarian Goulash	INT	7.2	7.2	1.1	7.0	7.1
	12 Mo.	6.2*	6.3*	5.9*	5.9*	6.3*
Neopolitan Spaghetti	INT	6.2	6.7	6.9	1.1	6.4
	12 Mo.	6.5	6.5**	6.1*	6.3*	6.3**
Pepper Steak	TNI	6.7	7.1	9.9	9.9	6.7
	12 Mo.	6.5	6.5	6.2	6.7	9.9
Spanish Steak	INT	7.1	7.3	9.9	6.7	7.0
	12 Mo.	6:7	6.4*	6.2	0.9	6.5 **
Tallerines	INT	7.2	7.4	7.4	7.2	7.2
	12 Mo.	6.9	*6.9	**6.9	7.1**	**6.9

Entree	Time	. Color	0dor	Flavor	Texture	Appearance
Yankee Pot Roast	INT	7.1	7.1	9.9	9.9	7.2
	12 Mo.	. 6.6*	*0°9	5.9*	£.9*	6.5 *
Perch Yucatan	INI	. 7.2	6.8	6.4	7.1	7.2
	12 Mo.	7.2**	**9*9	6.2**	7.0**	7.1**
Salmon Patties	INI	9.9	6.7	9.9	9.9	6.5
	12 Mo.	e.1**	6.2**	5.8	5.9*	5.7*
Seafood Au Gratin	INI	7.2	7.3	6.9	7.1	7.3
	12 Mo.	9.9	6.8 **	*0.9	5.8*	6.5*
Shrimp Creole	INI	7.4	7.1	7.0	, 9.9	7.3
	12 Mo.	6.8*	8.9	6.7	6.2	6.8**
Shrimp Newburg	INI	7.5	7.2	7.3	7.1	7.4
	12 Mo.	7.2	9.9	6.3*	*0.9	6.8**
Tuna Patties	INT	7.5	7.2	7.3	7.1	7.4
	12 Mo.	6.6 *	6.3*	6.2*	6.2*	6.4*
Ham Loaf	INT	7.3	7.0	7.4	6.9	7.0
	12 Mo.	6.4*	6.5	6.5*	6.3	6.1*
Breaded Pork Chops	INI	6.5	6.7	6.7	6.3	9.9
	12 Mo.	6.5	5.9	5.2*	5.6	6.1
Arroz Con Pollo	INI	7.5	7.4	7.4	7.3	7.6
	12 Mo.	*6.9	6.7*	6.5*	6.5*	7.0*
Chicken & Cornbread	F-	6	o u	6	v	7
010106600	111	•) (· ·) i	
	IZ Mo.	æ. •	c. o	æ.	o.	/.0
Chicken Parmesan	INI	6.7	8.9	6.7	6.3	9.9
	12 Mo.	6.9	6.7	6.5**	6.5 **	7.0
Oriental Chicken	INT	8.9	6.9	9.9	7.1	6.7
	;	•	4	(1	440

Table I Continued

	Time	Color	0dor	Flavor	Texture	Appearance
Oven Fried Chicken	INT	7.0	7.0	6.9	6.7	6.9
	12 Mo.	6.4*	*0.9	5.5*	6.3	6.1*
Savory Chicken	INI	8.9	6.9	6.5	6.3	8.9
	12 Mo.	6.4**	6.2*	5.8*	6.2	6.3*
Turkey Tetrazzini	INT	7.5	7.2	7.1	7.2	7.4
	12 Mo.	6.7*	6.4*	6.3*	6.2*	6.4*
Breaded Rabbit	INI	9.9	6.9	9.9	6.7	6.5
	12 Mo.	9.9	6.2*	6.1	6.2	6.5
Breaded Veal Cutlet	INI	7.0	6.9	7.0	8.9	6.5
	12 Mo.	6.1*	5.0*	4.2*	*0.9	2.9 *
Veal Balls Braised	INI	6.9	6.9	6.4	6.0	9.9
	12 Mo.	6.5 **	6.5	5.8	6.0	6.3
Yeal Cordon Bleu	INI	6.7	7.1	8.9	9.9	6.8
	6 Mo.	6.7	8.9	9.9	6.4	6.7
Veal Cutlets Baked	INI	6.5	6.9	6.5	6.2	6.5
	2 Mo.	6.4	6.5	6.3	5.8	6.3
Veal Loaf	INI	8.9	6.9	8.9	9.9	8.9
	12 Mo.	6.2**	6.1*	6.1	6.2	6.1*
Veal Parmesan	INI	7.4	7.2	8.9	6.4	7.0
	12 Mo.	*5.9	6.2*	5.8*	6.3	6.5
Ruben Sandwich	INT	7.2	7.2	7.0	8.9	7.3
	12 Mo.	6.5 *	6.3*	5.8*	6.1 *	6.5 *

Significant difference at least at the 5% level.

^{**} Refer to tables 2-36 for significant differences at intervals other than initial and 12 months.

Table 2 Panel Ratings for Barbecued Sliced Beef

	Œ			15			
	ROM	1 040	2 1MO	3 2MO	4 6MO	5	9
		£	£	윷	£	940	6 12MO · 15
	z	15	15	15	12	12	15
COLOR	ST.						
æ	ST. DEV	.40	.68	.78	.43	.47	.59
	AVG	6.9A	6.8A	7.0A	7.0A	7.1A	7.1A
900R	ST. DEV						
~	DEV	.59	.35	.41	90.	.62	96.
	AVG	7.1A	7.1A	7.2A	7.0A	6.9A	6.74
FLAVOR	ST. DEV	٠	•	•	•	•	
8	DEV	88.	.77	. 99	.58	.85	1.10
	AVG	6.9A	7.2A	6.9A	6.8A	6.6AE	6.1B
TEX	ST.						_
TEXTURE	ST. DEV	96.	.83	.83	1.30	.65	1.03
	AVG	6.7A	6.6A	6.5A	5.7A	6.6A	6.3A
APP	ST.						
APPEARANCE	ST. DEV	.53	.53	.52	.39	8.	.65
μį	AVG	7.0A	7.0A	7.1A	7.2A	7.0A	7.0A

Table 3 Panel Rating for Beef A La Mode

	ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV AVG
7.1AB .80 6.9AB .59	7.1AB .80 6.9AB .59
	7.1A
	5

Table 4 Panel Rating for Beef Stroganoff

			COLOR	×		000K		FLAVOR		TEXTURE		APPEARANCE	щ
	ROM	Z	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG
	1 040	15		97.	7.0A	.62	7.3A	1.01	7.2A	1.06	7.1A	97.	7.0A
	2 1140	15		.64	7.1A	88.	6.9A	. 92	7.1A	1.30	6.4A	. 59	7.1A
17	3 2MO	15		.46	6.9A	.46	7.1A	.59	94.9A	.83	6.4A	.46	6.9A
	4 6M0	13		. 38	6.8A	. 44	6.8A	.51	6.6A	1.07	6.2A	. 44	6.8A
	5 940	16		.45	6.7A	.37	7.0A	1.02	6.6A	1.24	6.1A	.70	6.7A
	6 12M0	13		.55	6.8A	09.	6.8A	.65	6.4A	.85	6.3A	71.	6.6A

Table 5 Panel Rating for Country Style Steak

									,	1						
			COLOR	%		000R	~		FLAVOR	Š		TEXTURE		APP	APPEARANCE	
ROM	æ	z	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG
	1 040	15		%	6.7A		.83	8.98		66.	6.5A	1.40	6.6A		96.	6.7A
	2 1MO	15		8.	6.7A		.83	6.9A		66.	6.5A	8.	6.3A		.52	6.9A
18	3 2M0	15		.76	7.0A		88	6.9A		1.18	6.7A	1.54	6.3A		.80	6.9A
	4 6M0	12		.00	7.0A		.41	7.0A		.60	6.8A	99.	6.5A		8.	7.0A
	5 940	10		.53	6.5A		. 95	5.78		90.1	5.38	76.	5.6A		.88	6.18
	6 12M0	12		.45	6.7A		.65	6.7A		. 98	6.3A	.67	.67 6.4A		.67	6.6AB

Table 6 Panel Rating for Creamed Chipped Beef

			20.00			900g			FLAVOR			TEXTURE		APPEARANCE	ш
S	7	z	ST. DEV	و	AVG	21.	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV		AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG
	1 040	15	•	.46	7.3A		. 35	7.1AB	.68		7.2A	.68	7.2A	.49	7.3A
	2 170	14	•	.59	7.1A		.70	6.9ABC	1.26		6.20	.68	6.8A	89.	7.0A
19	3 240	18	•	.47	7.1A		.42	6.9ABC			6.8ABC	.59		. 54	7.1A
	4 640	16	•	.54	7.2A		.45	7.2A	.68		6.9AB	.63		.48	7.3A
	5 940	12	•	.39	7.2A		.45	6.7BC	.67		6.6ABC	.43		.51	7.1A
	6 12M0	0 13	•	8	7.0A		.65	9.90		11.	6.4BC	.65	6.6A	.44	6.8A

Table 7 Panel Rating for Egg Foo Yung

			80 100		000R		FLAVOR		TEXTURE		APPEARANCE	ш
62	ROM	Z	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG		AvG	S	AVG
	1 040	15	88.	7.1A	.36 7.1A	7.1A	1.36	6.5A		7.2A		7.2A
20	2 1140	15	8.	7.0A	90.	.00 7.0A	.82 6.7A	6.7A		.53 7.0A	AL.7 52.	7.1A
)	2 2HD	16	44	V 6.9	.57	.57 6.9A	1.03	1.03 6.6A		6.6A	. 44	7.1A

Table 8 Panel Rating for Hungarian Goulash

			COLOR		900R			FLAVOR		TEXTURE		APP	APPEARANCE	414
æ	ROM	æ	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	DEV	AvG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG
	1 040	15	.41	7.2A		.41	7.2A	.80	7.1A	.65	7.0A		.64	7.1A
	2 1140	15	.64	7.1A		.46	7.1A	.56	6.8A	.64	6.9A		.80	7.1A
21	3 240	17	.43	7.1A		8.	7.0A	.60	6.9A	99.	6.8A		.43	7.1A
	4 6M0	13	.38	6.8A			6.8A	.51	6.6A	88.			.48	6.7AB
	5 980	16	00.	7.0A		.44	₩.9	77.	7.1A	.68	6.9A		44	7.1A
	6 12M0	91	.79	6.28		.8	6.38	.74	5.98	.88	5.98		.67	6.3B

Table 9 Panel Rating for Neopolitan Spaghetti

'n	AVG	6.48	6.7AB	6.9AB	7.2A	6.68	6.38
APPEARANCE	ST. DEV	.91	95.	.72	.83	.51	.75
	AVG	7.1A	7.0A	6.7AB	.66 7.2A	6.48	.63 6.3B
TEXTURE	ST. DEV	.53	. 53	1.13	99.	.67	.63
	AVG	6.9AB	7.0AB	6.8AB	7.1A	9.380	9.10
FLAVOR	ST. DEV	.88	. 93			.65	98.
	AVG	9.70	7.2AB	6.9ABC	7.3A	6.7BC	9.50
000R	ST. DEV	.72	.41	. 44	.79	.45	99.
	AVG	6.2A	6.8A	6.8A	7.0A	6.4A	6.5A
COLOR	ST. DEV	1.01	.56	99.	.89	.67	.78
	z	15	15	16	16	15	13
	ROM	1 040	2 140	3 2110	4 6M0	5 940	6 12MO

Table 10 Panel Rating for Pepper Steak

4.1	AVG	6.7A	6.6A	6.7A	8 .9	6.9A	6.6A
APPEARANCE	ST. DEV	.72	.63	.70	.55	.49	.51
	AVG	6.6A	6.8A	6.9A	6.8A	6.5A	6.7A
TEXTURE	ST. DEV	66.	.43	1.10	.60	88.	.85
	AVG	6.6A	6.7A	6.9A	6.5A	6.8A	6.2A
FLAVOR	ST. DEV	66.	.80	.80	99.	09.	.80
	AVG	7.1A	6.8A	6.9A	6.8A	6.9A	6.5A
ODOR	ST. DEV	.83	.56	. 35	8.	.49	99.
	AVG	6.7A	6.8A	7.1A	6.8A	7.0A	6.5A
COLOR	ST. DEV	.72	.41	.52	.60	.41	88.
	z	15	15	15	13	13	13
	ROM	1 040	2 1110	3 2M0	4 640	2 940	6 12M0

Table 11 Panel Rating for Spanish Steak

			COLOR	æ		ODOR	~		FLAVOR		TEX1	TEXTURE		APPEARANCE	m
ROM	-	z	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST.	ST. DEV	Avg	ST. DEV	AVG
-	1 040	15		.70	7.1A		.80	7.3A	1.18	6.6A		1.18 6.7A	6.7A	.65	7.0AB
2	2 1MO	15		.52	7.1A		.65	7.0A	.92	6.5A		1.05	6.7A	.53	7.0AB
5 1 m	3 2M0	14		.59	7.3A		.68		.85	7.0A		1.03	5.9A	.62	7.34
4	4 6M0	15		. 39	6.8A		9.		.51	6.6A		.52	6.5A	.58	6.8AB
G	5 9M0	13		.55	6.8A		.60		. 95			.77	6.6Å	.55	6.8AB
9	6 12M0	13		.63	6.7A		.65	6.48	1.09	1.09 6.2A		.83	6.0A	99.	6.58

Table 12 Panel Rating for Tallerines

APPEARANCE	ST. DEV AVG	.72 7.2A	.38 7.2A		.75 6.7AB		9 Y Y
¥	AVG ST	7.2A	7.2AB	7.0AB	98.98	6.40	7 1AR
TEXTURE	ST. DEV	.62	. 38	00.	09.	.51	46
	AVG	7.4A	7.1AB	7.2AB	9.680	6.30	6 9AR
FLAVOR	ST. DEV	.67	98.	.58	.87	.62	ď
	AVG	7.4A	980.9	7.08	6.8BC	9.50	A QRC
ODOR	ST. DEV	.51	.49	.60	.55	.52	46
	AVG	7.2A	7.0A	7.0A	6.8A	6.5A	4 6.9
COLOR	ST. DEV	.58	00.	00.	69.	.67	59
	z	12	13	11	13	12	15
	ROM	1 040	2 1140	3 2HO	4 6M0	5 940	6 12MO

Table 13 Panel Rating for Yankee Pot Roast

			;		6			EI AVOR		TEXTURE		APPEARANCE	ANCE	
			COLOR		Š							!		4
30	34	z	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	>	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV		AVG.
2		12	.35	7.1A	•	.46	7.1A	.83	6.6A	66.	6.6B	.56		7.2A
	, c	15	.41	7.2A	•		7.1A	.52	6.9A	.59	7.3A	.41		7.2A
2	3 280	17	.50	7.0A	•		6.9A	.61	6.6A	.72	6.5BC	.61		7.0A
3 6	A 6M0	12	.39	6.8AB	•	.39	6.8A	99.	6.3AB	1.00	6.180	ω.	.39	6.8AB
	2 0	14	.47	6.9AB	•	.73	6.7A	.70	6.8A	97.	9.580	.47		6.9A
	6 12M0	10	.52	6.68	•	.82	90°9	.74	36.3	.74	2.90	r.	. 53	6.58

Table 14 Panel Rating for Perch Yucatan

			Š	ş		audu		FLAVOR		TEXTURE		APPEARANCE	щ
8	WO.	Z	ST. D	DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG
	1 040	12		.45	7.2A	.72	6.8A	1.00	6.4A	.79	7.1A	.83	7.2A
	2 1M0	14		.53	7.1A	.83	6.7A	1.02	6.4A	.73	6.9AB	.53	7.1A
27	3 240	12		.67	7.1A	.67	6.4A	06.	6.6A	.75	6.7AB	. 58	6.8A
	4 6M0	13		.58	7.0A	. 85	6.3A	.80	6.2A	.87	6.4BC	.58	7.0A
	5 940	12		8.	6.48	1.06	5.28	1.00	5.18	06.	5.90	1.00	5.98
	6 12M0	15		.56	7.2A	.74	6.6A	98.	6.2A	.53	7.0AB	.52	7.1A

Table 15 Panel Rating for Salmon Patties

			<u></u>	COLOR		ODOR		FLAVOR		TEXTURE		APPEARANCE	ìй
_	ROM	Z	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	V AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG
	1 040	15		.63	6.6AB	.49			.74 6.6A	.63	6.6AB	.64	6.5A
	2 1MO	15		.46	6.9A	.41	1 6.8A		6.6A	.65	7.0A	.74	
28	3 2140	15		.83	6.5ABC	. 74	4 6.6AB	B . 99	6.5A	1.13	6.5AB	66.	6.5A
	4 6M0	12		.65	6.380	.51		BC . 97	6.3A	.83	5.80	79.	6.5A
	5 9M0	13		.82	9.00	. 95	26.5	.82	6.0A	.82	6.080	.95	5.9AB
	6 12M0	13		.64	6.180	.73	3 6.2BC	. 80	5.8A	97.	5.980	.75	5.78

Table 16 Panel Rating for Seafood Au Gratin

		COLOR		000K		FLAVOR		TEXTURE	TEXTURE	TEXTURE APPEARANCE
ROM	Z	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEY	AVG	ST. DEV	ST. DEV AVG	
1 040	15	.68	7.2A	.59	7.3A	88	6.9A	.92	A1.7 26.	
2 140	15	.46	6.9AB	.53	7.0AB	1.03	6.9A	1.26	1.26 6.280	
3 2MO	13	09.	7.2A	.73	7.2A	1.04	6.9A	.90	.90 6.8AB	
4 640	14	.47	6.9AB	97.	9.680	.85	6.4AB	.92	.92 6.180	
5 940	15	.80	6.30	1.06	9.10	1.35	29-5	1.32		5.80
6 12MO	0 12	.51	6.6BC	. 39	6.8AB	.60	6.0BC	96.	.94 5.80	

Table 17 Panel Rating for Shrimp Creole

			COLOR		000R		FLAVOR		TEXTURE	;	APPEARANCE	
		Z	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AvG	ST. DEV	AVG	SI. DEV	AYG
1 940		16	.51	7.4A	.57	7.1A	.89	7.0A	1.02	1.02 6.6A	.48	7.3AB
2 1MO		15	.52	7.1ABC	.80	6.9A	1.10	6.7A	1.29	6.3A	11.	7.2ABC
3 240		14	.91	7.3AB	.74	7.4A	1.07	6.9A	1.28	6.6A	.65	7.4A
4 6M0		13	.49	6.9BC	09.	6.8A	99.	6.5A	.82	6.0A	.49	6.9BC
\$		13	44	9.80	. 44	6.8A	99.	6.5A	.95	6.1A	.44	9.80
6 12MO	_	12	.58	6.880	.72	6.8A	.62	6.7A	.72	6.2A	.58	6.8BC

Table 18 Panel Rating for Shrimp Newburg

			COLOR		ODOR		FLAVOR		TEXTURE		APPEARANCE	ы
	ROM	z	ST. DEV	.v AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG
	1 040	15	.64	4 7.5A	11.	7.2A	.82	7.3A	.64	7.1A	.74	7.4A
3	2 1MO	15	96.		1.06	7.1A	1.16	7.1AB	1.21	6.8AB	1.01	7.2AB
1	3 2M0	14	. 78		.62	7.1A	.83	6.7ABC	1.07	6.380	.73	6.780
	4 640	13	90.	0 7.0A	.48	6.7A	.48	6.7ABC	.58	9.00	11.	6.40
	2 940	13	. 38		.48	6.7A	99	6.580	.95	5.90	.63	6.780
	6 12M0	12	.39	9 7.2A	.51	6.6A	.78	6.30	.74	9.00	.58	6.8ABC

Table 19 Panel Rating for Tuna Patties

ш	AVG	7.4A	6.8BC	7.1AB	6.8BC	6.9ABC	6.4C
APPEARANCE	ST. DEV	.74	11.	.70	.38	.49	11.
	AVG	7.1A	6.28	6.9A	6.8AB	6.6AB	6.28
TEXTURE	ST. DEV	.64	98.	.80	.60	11.	.90
	AVG	7.3A	6.7ABC	7.0AB	6.580	9.20	6.20
FLAVOR	ST. DEV	.82	.70	.93	.78	1.07	66.
	AVG	7.2A	6.9A	7.0A	6.8AB	6.7AB	6.3B
ODOR	ST. DEV	77.	.70	.65	.44	.75	.85
	AVG	7.5A	7.080	7.1AB	6.980	980.9	9.60
COLOR	ST. DEV	.64	.53	.35	.49	.49	.51
	z	15	15	15	13	13	13
	ROM	1 040	2 1M0	3 240	4 6MO	5 940	6 12MO

Table 20 Panel Rating for Ham Loaf

APPEARANCE	AVG ST. DEV AVG	6.9A85 7.0A	6.7A .92 6.5AB		6.5A .60 6.8A	6.8A .52 6.5AB	
TEXTURE	ST. DEV	1.03	.46	.94	99.	89.	40
	AVG	7.4A		7.1AB		6.78	4
FLAVOR	ST. DEV	.91	.59	96.	69.	.62	77
	AVG	7.0A	6.6A	7.0A	6.8A	6.7A	A 5.
ODOR	ST. DEV	.85	.74	.76	69.	.62	78
	AVG	7.3A	6.6B	6.9AB	6.7AB	6.58	A A B
COLOR	ST. DEV	.70	.83	. 92	.63	.64	45
	z	15	15	15	13	15	7
	ROM	1 040	2 1M0	3 2M0	4 640	5 940	6 1240

•

Table 21 Panel Rating for Breaded Pork Chops

			COL 08		000R		FLAVOR		TEXTURE		APPEARANCE	Lu I
ā	70	2	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG
2			;	6.5A	.72	6.7A	.80	6.7A	.80	6.3A	.83	6.6A
	5 P		88.	6.4A	.91	6.2A	.93	6.1AB	.79	6.3A	. 95	6.3A
3+	2 2 60		-	5 .9	.67	6.4A	.67	5.98	.79	6.4A	.62	6.7A
	4 6MO			6.6A	.52		.80	6.2AB	.80	5.8A	.52	6.5A
	S 940		79. 2	6.5A	.49	6.3A	.60	80.9	.74	6.0A	.72	6.2A
	6 12M0	2MO 13	3 .52	6.5A	.76	.76 5.9A	1.07	5.20	.65	5.6A	.49	6.1A

Table 22 Panel Rating for Arroz Con Pollo

			COLOR		900R	~		FLAVOR		TEXTURE		APP	APPEARANCE	141
æ	ROM	z	ST. DEV	AVG	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG
	1 040	18	.79	7.5A		.70	7.4A	1.14	7.4A	.84	7.3A		.85	7.6A
	2 1140	15	.64	7.1AB		.52	7.1AB	.74	7.1AB	. 85	7.0AB		.59	7.3AB
35	3 240	14	.65	7.5A		.58	7.2AB	98.	7.1AB	.73	6.9AB		.63	7.6A
	4 640	13	.49	6.9B		8.	6.8BC	69.	6.8AB	69.	6.20		.38	6.8B
	2 940	12	.51	7.1AB		.45	6.7BC	.51	99.9	.45	6.7AB		.51	7.18
	6 12MO	13	.76	6.9B		.75	97.9	.97	6.58	.78	9.BC		. 58	7.08

Table 23 Panel Rating for Chicken and Cornbread Casserole

			CO108		000g		FLAVOR		TEXTURE		APPEARANCE	ш
2	ROM	z	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG
	1 990	15	.53	7.0A	.35	6.9A	8.	7.0A	.83	6.6A	88.	6.7A
36	2 1140	16	.37	7.0A	.68	6.7A	99.	6.8A	.81	6.6A	.58	6.7A
	3 240	12	00.	7.0A	.39	6.8A	.62	6.7A	.51	AL.7	.39	7.2A
	640	13	.65	6.6A	.75	6.7A	.52	6.5A	99.	6.5A	99.	6.5A
	5 940	13	.48	6.7A	.52	6.5A	.52	6.5A	99.	6.5A	11.	6.4A
	6 12MO	13	4.	6 .84	.52	6.5A	.60	6.8A	99.	6.5A	. 48	6.7A

Table 24 Panel Rating for Chicken Parmesan

				COLOR	~		90 80	~		FLAVOR		TEXTURE		APPEARANCE	'n
Z	ROM		z	ST. 0	DEV	AVG	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG
	1 040	9	18	•	.89	6.7A		.62	6.8A	.89	6.7A	96.	6.3	1.04	6.6A
	2 1110		15	•	66	6.4A		.72	6.7A	1.13	6.5AB	1.05	6.7A	1.19	6.1A
37	3 240		11	•	.81	6.4A	•	1.25	6.2A	1.22	6.1ABC	.79	6.3A	.82	6.5A
	4 640		12	•	.72	6.2A		.87	6.3A	.89	5.780	.67	6.6A	.72	6.2A
	ر و	9 1 6	10	•	62	6.2A		66.	5.9A	1.07	5.40	.67	5.38	8.	6.1A
	6 12M0		13	•	.76	6.9A		.75	6.7A	.97	6.5AB	.78	6.5A	89.	7.0A

Table 25 Panel Rating for Oriental Chicken

			COLOR	×		000R	<i>م</i>		FLAVOR	<i>م</i> ہ		TEXTURE	URE		APPEARANCE	CE
	26	Z	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	:ر	AVG	ST. DEV	DEV	AvG	ST. DEV	AVG
	1 040	15		8.	6.8AB		.52	6.9AB	•	.91	6.6A	•	. 36	7.1A	.70	6.7ABC
	2 1140	13		.41	7.0A		.6 8	6.8AB	~	.60	6.8A	•	.60	6.8ABC	.49	6.9AB
3	3 2110	12		.51	7.1A		.51	7.1A	•	.39	7.2A	•	.51	6.9AB	.51	7.1A
3	4 6M0	13		.52	6.5B		.51	6.40	Ť	99.	6.5A	•	.83	6.2C	.52	6.580
	5 940	13		.48	6.7AB		99.	6.580	-:	.52	6.5A	•	99.	9.580	11.	
	6 12M0	15		.53	7.0A		.65	7.0A	•	.74	6.9A	•	.88	7.1AB	.38	7.0A

Table 26 Panel Rating for Oven Fried Chicken

			COLOR		ODOR		FLAVOR		TEXTURE		APPEARANCE	ш
-	MOM MOM	Z	ST. DEV	EV AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG
•	1 040	15	9.	.65 7.0A	.53	7.0A	. 83	6.9A	.98	6.7A	.70	6.9A
	2 1MO	15	9	.64 7.1A	.52	6.9A	. 74	6.9A	. 86	6.8A	.94	7.2A
39	3 240	15	ω̈́	.80 6.7AB	.72	6.7AB	1.13	1.13 6.1BC	1.28	6.3A	.83	6.7AB
	4 6M0	12	•	.39 6.8AB	.52	6.5ABC	.52	6.5AB	.39	6.8A	.65	6.7AB
	5 940	13		.75 6.38	.73	6.280	.60	5.8CD	.71	6.0A	97.	5.90
	6 12M0) 13	:	.96 6.48	.71	9.00	99.	5.50	.95	6.3A	. 95	6.180

Table 27 Panel Rating for Savory Chicken

ST. DEV .64 .52 .57

Table 28 Panel Rating for Turkey Tetrazzini

			90100	٥		ODOR			FLAVOR		TEXTURE		APPEARANCE	w
	:	2	3 F	2	AVG	ST. DEV	DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG
X Y Y	¥ .	<u>.</u> 2		.62	7.5A	;	4.	7.2A	.60	Ar.7	99.	7.2A	.80	7.4A
		; <u>र</u>		59	7.3AB		.46	7.148	88.	6.7AB	96.	46.9	.77	7.2A
741	OMC C	1 1		, s	7 .3AB		99.	7.2A	.97	6.8AB	1.25	6.8AB	88.	7.2A
	S CMO	: 2		82	6.8BC		09.	7.0AB	.75	6.7AB	.65	6.7AB	.67	6.9AB
	2 2 2 2 2	15		8	7.080		.62	6.780	1.01	5.80	96.	6.18	.63	6.48
		2		49	6.70		.67	6.40	.45	6.380	.58	6.2B	.51	6.4B

Table 29 Panel Rating for Breaded Rabbit

			COLOR	9		900R	œ		FLAVOR		TEXTURE		APP	APPEARANCE	
2	70	Z	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG
	1 040	14		74	6.6A		.36	8 6.9	.63	6.6A	.73	6.7A		.74	6.6A
	2 1110	15		%:	6.9A		.64	6.5ABC	.82	6.7A	.86	6.8A		90	6.7A
12	3 2MD	12		.49	6.7A		49	6.7AB	.45	6.7A	.49	6.7A		.49	6.7A
	4 6M0	13		.55	6.8A		.52	6.5ABC	09.	6.2A	.55	6.8A		.48	6.7A
	5 940	12		.51	6.9A		.49	6.3BC	.67	6.4A	.49	6.3A		.67	6.6A
	6 12MO	13		.51	6.6A		.80	9.20	.76	6.1A	44.	6.2A		.52	6.5A

4

Table 30 Panel Rating for Breaded Veal Cutlet

		COLOR		ODOR		FLAVOR		TEXTURE		APPEARAN	ж
ROW	z	ST. DEV	AvG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG
1 040	15	.53	7.0A	.52	6.9A	.85	7.0A	.68	6.8A	.83	6.5AB
2 1MO	17	.50	7.0A	.50	7.0A	.71	7.0A	.70	6.9A	.53	6.8A
3 2M0	17	.59	6.7AB	.37	7.0A	.75	6.8A	1.17	6.18	.80	6.5ABC
4 640	13	99.	6.5AB	.48	6.7A	1.04	5.98	.90	5.8B	.73	6.2BC
5 940	12	.49	6.380	1.24		1.28	5.00	.65	5.78	.51	26.3
6 12M0	13	92.	9.10	1.15	5.0B	1.28	4.20	.71	90.9	.76	5.90
	0W 1 0MO 2 1M0 3 2M0 4 6M0 5 9M0 6 12M0	0M0 1M0 2M0 6M0 9M0	N ST. 1 0M0 15 1M0 17 2M0 17 6M0 13 9M0 12 1ZM0 13	N COLLOR OMO 15 .53 1MO 17 .50 2MO 17 .59 6MO 13 .66 9MO 12 .49 1ZMO 13 .76	M ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV OMO 15 .53 7.0A ST. DEV IMO 17 .50 7.0A .52 2MO 17 .59 6.7AB .50 6MO 13 .66 6.5AB .48 9MO 12 .49 6.3BC 1.24 12MO 13 .76 6.1C 1.15	M ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV DMO 15 53 7.0A 52 IMO 17 50 7.0A 50 ZMO 17 59 6.7AB 37 GMO 13 66 6.5AB 48 9MO 12 49 6.3BC 1.24 1ZMO 13 76 6.1C 1.15	M ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV FLA OMO 15 .53 7.0A .52 6.9A ST. 1M0 17 .50 7.0A .50 7.0A ST. 2M0 17 .59 6.7AB .37 7.0A ST. 6M0 13 .66 6.5AB 1.24 6.7A ST. 9M0 12 .49 6.3BC 1.24 5.4B ST. 12M0 13 .76 6.1C 1.15 5.0B ST.	OMOR FLAVOR OMO ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV FLAVOR OMO 15 53 7.0A 52 6.9A ST. DEV IMO 17 50 7.0A 7.0A 7.0A 71 EMO 17 59 6.7AB 7.0A 7.0A 7.75 GMO 13 66 6.5AB 48 6.7A 11.04 9MO 12 49 6.3BC 11.24 5.4B 11.28 12MO 13 76 6.1C 11.15 5.0B 11.28	OMOR FLAVOR TE OMO ST. DEV AVG AVG AVG AVG AVG	M ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV ST. DEV	COLLOR AVG ST. DEV AVG AVG ST. DEV AVG AVG ST. DEV AVG AVG ST. DEV AVG AVG AVG AVG ST. DEV AVG AVG

Table 31 Panel Rating for Veal Balls Braised

					1		i		n district		ADDEARANCE	بيو
		COLOR			000K		FLAVOR		IEAIURE			į
ROM	z	ST. DEV	EV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG
1 040	16		.50	6.9AB	68.	6.9A	96.	6.4A	1.63	1.63 6.0A	.81	6.6A
2 1140	15		.46	6.9A	.70	46.9	.83	6.5A	.49	6.3A	.46	6.7A
3 240	16		.68	6.9A	.50	6.9A	.91	6.2A	.73	6.6A	99.	6.8A
4 6MO	14		.61	9.30	.74	6.4A	.93	6.4A	.89	5.8A	.63	6.4A
5 940) 12		.39	6.8AB	.45	6.7A	.79	6.4A	.67	6.5A	.45	
6 12MO	f0 13		99.	6.5BC	99.	6.5A	. 80	5.8A	.82	6.0A	.63	6.3A

Table 32 Panel Rating for Veal Cordon Bleu

			COLOR	ĕ		ODOR		FLAVOR		TEXTURE		APPEARANCE	'n
-	ROM	z	ST.	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG		AVG	ST. DEV	AVG
	1 040	14		.83	6.7A	.36	7.1A	1.05 6.8A	6.8A	1.34 6.6A	6.6A	8.	6.8A
145	2 140	15		.59	7.1A	.64	46.9	.70	7.1A		6.5A	.59	7.1A
5	3 2MO	15		.72	6.7A	.82	6.7A	1.06	6.9A		6.5A	.74	6.5A
	4 6M0	12		.97	6.7A	.83		.80	.80 6.5A		.90 6.4A	86.	6.7A

Table 33 Panel Rating for Veal Cutlets Baked

			80 103		000g		FLAVOR	÷	TEXTURE		APPEARANCE	и
~	ROM	Z	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV	AVG	ST. DEV AVG	AVG	ST. DEV AVG	AVG	ST. DEV AVG	AVG
	1 040	15	.52	6.5A	4.	9 6.9A		6.5A	8.	6.2A	.52	6.5A
14	2 1MO	15	.68	6.8A	.5.	.52 6.9A		6.8A	1.06	6.1A	8.	.86 6.8A
6	3 240	15	.91	6.4A	œ́	.83 6.5A	.98	6.3A	1.01	5.8A	88.	6.3A

Table 34 Panel Rating for Veal Loaf

	AVG	6.8A	7.0A	6.6AB	6.7A	6.9A	6.18
APPEARANCE	ST. DEV	.70	. 85	%	.48	.70	.86
	AVG	6.6A	7.1A	6.4A	6.5A	6.8A	6.2A
TEXTURE	ST. DEV	.76	.80	1.15	. 66	.68	. 80
	AVG	6.8A	7.1A	6.5A	6.6A	6.6A	6.1A
FLAVOR	ST. DEV	. 89	. 92	1.15	.65	. 74	98.
ODOR	AVG	6.9A	7.0A	6.9A	6.3A	6.9A	6.18
ODOR	ST. DEV	.53	.65	.72	.48	.52	.64
	AVG	6.8AB	7.2A	6.9A	6.7AB	6.9A	6.28
COLOR	ST. DEV	. 89	.68	.81	85.	.46	.93
	z	14	15	16	13	15	13
	ROM	1 040	2 1140	3 240	049 *	5 940	6 12MO

Table 35 Panel Rating for Veal Parmesan

EV AVG	73 7.0A	86 7.2A	33 6.9A	•	39 6.8A	.66 6.5A
ST. D	•	•	•	•	•	•
AVG	6.4A	7.2A	6.4A	6.2A	6.5A	6.3A
ST. DEV	1.20	8.	1.00	.83	.67	.85
AVG	6.8AB	7.0A	6.7ABC	6.2BCD	6.100	5.80
ST. DEV	.83	.65	. 85	.73	1.08	.93
AVG	7.2A	7.1AB	6.9ABC	6.600	6.7BCD	6.20
ST. DEV	.58	. 35	.70	.51	.49	.83
AVG	7.4A	7.3AB	7.080	6.8CD	7.0BC	6.50
ST. DEV	.50	.59	8.	88.	00.	99.
Z	16	15	11	13	12	13
ROM	1 940	2 1110	3 240	4 640	5 940	6 1240
	N ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV AVG	N ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV ONO 16 .50 7.4A .58 7.2A .83 6.8AB 1.20 6.4A .73	N ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV ST. ST. DEV ST. ST. DEV ST. DEV ST. ST. DEV	ONO 16 .50 7.4A .58 7.2A .83 6.8AB 1.20 6.4A .77 2NO 17 .59 7.3AB .35 7.1AB .65 7.0A .86 7.2A .86 2NO 17 .00 7.0BC .70 6.9ABC .85 6.7ABC 1.00 6.4A .33	ONO 16 57. DEV AVG ST. DEV ST. DE	W ST. DEV AVG ST. DEV ST. ST. DEV ST. DEV ST. ST. DEV ST. DEV ST. ST.

Table 36 Panel Rating for Ruben Sandwich

	AVG	7.3A	6.9ABC	7.0AB	7.0AB	6.780	9.50
APPEARANCE	ST. DEV	. 60		.43 7	.41 7	.49	
	AVG	6.8AB	6.7AB	6.9A	6.8AB	6.3ABC	9.10
TEXTURE	ST. DEV	.75	.49	.51		.49	98.
	AVG	7.0A	7.3A	7.0A	6.8A	6.28	5.88
FLAVOR	ST. DEV	.82	.65	.43	.55	.53	.80
	AVG	7.2A	7.2A	7.0A	46.9	6.7A	6.38
ODOR	ST. DEV	.54	.39	.00	.49	.45	.75
	AVG	7.2A	7.1AB	7.0ABC	7.0ABC	6.7BC	9.50
COLOR	ST. DEV	11.	.51	.43	8.	.45	99.
	z	16	21	12	13	12	13
	ROW	1 040	五 2 140	3 240	4 6M0	5 940	6 12MO